

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12, 15, 35-40, and 57-60 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 9-13, 15, 35, 36, 38-40, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Tsumagari et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,057) and Stonedahl (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0199198).

Claims 3, 14, 37, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Tsumagari and Koyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,385).

Administrative Matter

As an initial matter, an apparent mistake is being brought to the examiner's attention. It appears that the RCE notice from the previous Office action (mailed July 22, 2009) had been inadvertently included on page 2 of the Detailed Action in the instant Office action. No remedial action is believed to be required. However, if corrective action is required, the examiner is respectfully requested to do so.

Claimed Invention

The claims have been amended to recite more specific aspects of the disclosed invention, thereby further distinguishing the claimed invention over the cited art.¹ An illustrative embodiment of the claimed invention is illustrated by the video paper 232 shown in Fig. 2. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

During recording of an information stream (e.g., video recording), some user-identified events may occur more than once. For example, the specification discloses an example of a study of people opening a package, where events of interest to a user might include "uses scissors," "uses teeth," etc. During recording of the study, occurrences of the events will

¹ Since the examiner rejected all of the limitations in the independent claims as allegedly being taught by the cited art, such limitations have been canceled from the independent claims without conceding the merits of the rejection and incorporated in respective **appended dependent claims (57-60)**. The amended independent claims are more focused on a particularly salient aspect of the present invention.

occur at various times during the recording. Each occurrence of the event is noted (e.g., by noting time of occurrence of the event) using event markers.

The claimed invention is directed to providing access to an information stream that is associated with such event markers. A plurality of the event markers are received, each being associated with multiple segments of the information stream. Representative images of segments of the information stream are displayed for each event marker.

A distinguishing aspect of the claimed event markers is that they can be associated with multiple segments of the information stream. This aspect of the claimed invention is explicitly set forth in the claim language.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite in pertinent part:

1. A method for providing access to an information stream comprising:
receiving information representative of a plurality of event markers, each event marker being associated with a user-identified event and further associated with a plurality of segments of the information stream that are determined by a user to be related to the user-identified event, wherein a first event marker is associated with a first segment of the information stream and a second segment of the information stream; and
for each event marker, displaying representative images of the segments of the information stream that are associated with said each event marker in accordance with an arrangement format, including for the first event marker, displaying a first representative image of the first segment of the information stream and displaying a second representative image of the second segment of the information stream.
(underlining added for emphasis)

See also similarly amended independent claims 15 and 35. No new matter has been added.

Tsumagari does not teach the “event markers” recited in the currently amended claims, nor as recited in the previously presented claims. For example, in the previously presented claims, the event marker “being associated with a plurality of time indices that are points in time in the information stream.” The Office action rejected the limitation as follows:

receiving information representative of a plurality of event markers (Figs. 23, 24, 25, 27 - entry points), each event marker being associated with a plurality of time indices that are points in time in the information stream (in at least Figs. 14, 25, 27);

A review of Figs. 14, 25, and 27 in particular do not reveal that Tsumagari's "entry point" is associated with plural time indices. In fact, Fig. 25, which illustrates the data structure for an "entry point." There is only one piece of data that might be called a time index, namely "presentation time of entry point."

Despite the failure of Tsumagari to teach an event marker that is associated with plural time indices, claim 7 has been amended to further distinguish over Tsumagari. Claim 7 as currently amended recites each entry point "being associated with a user-identified event and further associated with a plurality of segments of the information stream ... related to the user-identified event."

Tsumagari does not teach that each "entry point" is associated with plural segments of the information stream. Fig. 25 of Tsumagari, for example, shows the entry point includes a single time value, namely "presentation time of entry point." Fig. 27 shows multiple entry points, but as Tsumagari explains in column 20, lines 61-65:

More specifically, as exemplified in FIG. 27, an entry point (corresponding to a "bookmark" compared to a book) can be set at an arbitrary position of each program, and text such as "barbecue with family" can be stored in primary text information PRM_TXTI (FIG. 25) of that entry point.

Clearly, each entry point is associated with only one segment of the program, namely its bookmarked portion. Tsumagari therefore does not teach "receiving information representative of a plurality of event markers, each event marker being associated with a user-identified event and further associated with a plurality of segments of the information stream that are determined by a user to be related to the user-identified event," as recited in amended claim 7 and similarly in amended claims 15 and 35.

To further distinguish Tsumagari, the amended claims recite a specific "first event marker is associated with a first segment of the information stream and a second segment of the information stream." Tsumagari does not teach such first event marker, as discussed with respect to Figs. 25 and 27. Moreover, none of Figs. 35-37 and 39 teach such first event marker.

These figures show four different titles, “cinderella,” “peace,” “party,” and “hurry-up business man.” Fig. 36 illustrates an entry point for each title, but does not show that a first entry point that is associated with a first segment and with a second segment.

Accordingly, Tsumagari does not teach the recited limitation:

“receiving information representative of a plurality of event markers, each event marker being associated with a user-identified event and further associated with a plurality of segments of the information stream that are determined by a user to be related to the user-identified event, wherein a first event marker is associated with a first segment of the information stream and a second segment of the information stream;”

See also similarly amended claims 15 and 35.

Since Tsumagari does not teach the foregoing “event marker” having plural segments of the information stream associated with it, Tsumagari likewise cannot be fairly construed to teach:

“for each event marker, displaying representative images of the segments of the information stream that are associated with said each event marker in accordance with an arrangement format, including for the first event marker, displaying a first representative image of the first segment of the information stream and displaying a second representative image of the second segment of the information stream.”

A review of the other art of record does not reveal such “event markers.”

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the art based at least on the allowability of their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/618,201
Amdt. dated March 12, 2010
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2621

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/George B. F. Yee/

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cml
62426723 v1